Journal of the
ANDHRA HISTORICAL
RESEARCH SOCIETY

VOL. XIII JULY 1940 PART II

REVENUE ADMINISTRATION OF THE NORTHERN CIRCARS

DR. LANKA SUNDARAM, M. A., Ph. D.

CHAPTER IV.

DIRECT MANAGEMENT AND THE FIRST COMMITTEE OF CIRCUIT (1769—1779)

(Continued from p. 34 of the previous issue)

In a letter dated 19 November 1773, the Masulipatam Council laid their finger upon some of the vital issues connected with zamindari rights in the Sarkars.[1] They found out that no further increase of the revenues of the Sarkars would be possible unless certain zamindari abuses which had gained currency during the lax administration of the government of Hyderabad and slowly obtained a show of legality, were corrected. The turbulence of the zamindars in the Sarkars and their refusal to pay tribute to the Dekkan government resulted in their complete reduction by Nizam-ul Mulk in 1730 and the wholesale conversion of their zamindaries into *haveli* lands. But the anarchy which prevailed after his death gave the dispossessed zamindars an opportunity to re-establish their power and procure formal *sanads* from the subsequent weak governments at Hyderabad sanctioning their pretensions. They never paid any tribute and practically remained independent of outside control.

1 *Masulipatam to Madras.* 19 November 1773, No. 233. *idem* 26 November Vol. 36, pp. 776—82.

Similar arguments have been used by John Sullivan, for sometime a member of the Masulipatam Council, in his letter addressed to the Court of Directors, dated 3 February 1779, on the revenue and judicial management of the Northern Sarkars, See his *Tracts Upon India*, pp. 156—254.

This letter is a very important contribution to our knowledge of the condition in the Sarkars and offers several relevant suggestions for the improvement of the administration.

Nearly all the zamindars maintained considerable *sibbandies* and unable to support them from the legitimate revenues of their countries, reimbursed themselves by means of official plunder and mutual encroachments whenever opportunities were available. They further found occasion to levy cesses on the defenceless inhabitants. Since the government's share of the revenues had been based upon the net receipts from the country, the heavy expenses of the *sibbandies* deprived the central authority of a considerable portion of its legitimate claims. The first method of increasing the company's revenues would be to restrain the zamindars "from retaining a greater number of people than may be sufficient for their necessary attendance upon occasions of public ceremony".

Next to this wastage of public revenues on the maintenance of useless troops, the zamindars enjoyed "civil rights" originally belonging to the government. Foremost among them was that of imposing and collecting duties upon various articles of merchandise, "a right which the Zamindars even now indirectly acknowledge to be in the government, for these collections are made under the denomination of Circar Customs and are distinct from those which they claim as their Zamindari fees". Yet they warmly asserted their right to these customs on the principle of continued enjoyment and as the last resource pleaded that they constitute a considerable part of their revenues. But this plea of theirs was, in the opinion of the Council, fallacious. For one thing, more than half of the trade in the Sarkars was allowed to pass duty free, simply because the zamindars were afraid of offending the Company's servants at the different factories in the Sarkars. If only the other half of the trade in the Sarkars was freed from these heavy collections the ultimate net increase of revenue would be at least a lakh of rupees every year clear of all deductions.

The Masulipatam Council proposed the establishment of a general quit-rent upon every house-holder in the Sarkars. They pointed out that already merchants, weavers and 'mechanics' (artisans) pay to the zamindars a tax more or less resembling a quit-rent. Even though the husbandmen were so far exempt from it, they would be only too willing to pay this to the Company in exchange for their freedom from the "arbitrary rule of the Zamindars" and a closer protection of their rights. "The husbandmen in the Circars are, for the most part, proprietors by hereditary succession for many generations of the land they cultivate and are even now considered by the Zamindars as rightful holders of these lands, but however secure their tenure may appear from this, on examination it will be found so precarious as scarcely to deserve the name". The establishment of a general quit-rent preceded by a definition of the rights of the

husbandmen would, they argued, considerably add to the Company's revenues.

As a final method of improving the revenues, they suggested an excise on beetle, tobacco and *arrak* produced or manufactured and retailed throughout the Sarkars. In support of their sanguine hopes of a considerable revenue from them, they quoted the fact that the licensing fees for the sale of *arrak* in the Pettah (Indian quarter) of Masulipatam alone produced an annual revenue of Rs. 11,000. Concluding their arguments, the Masulipatam Council observed that, on a comparative view, the income from all these sources would at least add fifty per cent to the current revenues from the Sarkars.

The Madras government were extremely reluctant to adopt the recommendations of Masulipatam in their entirety.[1] They opined that in proposing these sweeping changes the subordinate settlement has not paid "proper attention to the rights and privileges of the Zamindars in preserving which the honor of the Company has been pledged in frequent declarations and particularly in the articles of agreement concluded with the Zamindars in 1766" by General Caillaud at the conference convened at Ellore.[2]

Views of the Madras government thereon

The government were not at all satisfied with the argument that the zamindars had assumed military authority only during the anarchy that had followed the death of Nizam-ul Mulk. On the other hand, it was "always understood that even in the times before the Mahomedans conquered India, Zamindars held their authority on a military tenure, not differing in any material from the feudal system in Europe when in its full vigour". The zamindars only paid a quit-rent to the government and "maintained a body of troops proportionable to the lands which they occupied". Further, "we also acknowledge a power in the Zamindars to keep up a military force since it is stipulated in the first article of the agreement of 1766". As such, "we do not see how we can in justice oblige them to relinquish it". But since the Company's military forces were adequate to defend this country and the zamindari *sibbandies* could only eat up the revenues therefrom, they directed the Chief of Masulipatam to use every argument "to induce (the zamindars) to disband or lessen the number of their troops and that they be released from the engagement by which they are bound to afford military aid to the government, but further we do not think we can go without a reflection upon our justice and public faith".

1 Resolution of the Madras government in *Pub. Cons.* 26 November 1773, Vol. 36. pp, 782—89.

2 For this important agreement on which the rights of the zamindars mostly depend, see Appendix C to this thesis.

With respect to the right to collect duties the government maintained that the zamindars had passed it for quite a long time. That it had existed in 1749 they were clearly convinced. They quoted the findings of the investigation they had undertaken to determine the validity of the French claim to exemption from duty for all the articles of trade which they had been handling in the Sarkars.[1] They further recalled the findings of Sir Robert Harland who was specially deputed from England to settle the disputes between the two nations. Commenting on this the government wrote home that the French "were sometimes excused in consideration of presents to the Zamindars, but the right of exacting duties does not appear ever to have been disputed and the custom of giving presents, in which all the Zamindars agree, is clearly an acknowledgment of that right".[2] If ever the zamindars allowed *sahukars* and other traders to pass goods duty free it was only in consideration of such presents.

The government recognised that the zamindars had a determinate right to collect what was generally known as juncan.[3] This was evident from the implications of the clause in Caillaud's agreement with them which provided a free passage for the military stores of the Company. But, they confessed that they were not clear as to the distinction between *juncan* and the Sarkar (government) duties. More complicated was the issue, how far the zamindars had unlawfully appropriated to themselves and at what periods, if any, duties on several articles which they now claimed as part of their legitimate revenues. This was a subject which they were willing carefully to investigate into and determine upon at a more convenient time. Still they were determined to improvise methods which would answer the ultimate purpose in view. "For altho' we are of opinion that the government may not lawfully take the collection of duties out of the hands of the Zamindars, yet they may (the government) with propriety, establish rules and raise or lower them as they shall think necessary".[4]

With regard to the imposition of excise duties the government were not clear "how far such taxes may affect the interest and privileges of the Zamindars or be burthensome to the inhabitants". They demonstrated the calculations of the Chief and Council at Masulipatam regarding the probable increase of revenues from this imposition to be wrong. The quantities of *arrak* and beetle

1 For a discussion on the French claims see *Pub. Cons.* 18 July, 1768, Vol. 27. pp. 542-43; *idem.* 5 February 1773 Vol, 35. p. 74.

2 *Madras Letters Received.* 29 January 1773, (Du Pre) paras. 23-27 Vol. VI

3 Corruption for the Sanskrit *sumkam*, meaning a tax.

4 Resolution of the Madras government in *Pub. Cons.* 26 November, 1778, Vol. 20, pp. 789-80.

consumed in the Sarkars were "very trifling". Hence, no rule of three could be applied on the basis of the *arrak* revenue of the *pettah* of Masulipatam to the general prospective revenues to be expected from an excise duty on them. They conceded that tobacco was grown in the Sarkars in plenty, "but, as the Zamindars receive a high rent or duty upon the growth, ...another duty upon its being carried through the country as an article of trade (might altogether) discourage the cultivation of it, in which case the interest of the Zamindar must materially suffer". [1]

They also disapproved of the imposition of a quit-rent upon the husbandmen. They observed: "We apprehend a tax of this kind, supposing we have a right to levy it, might bear too hard upon the people in general, who are already to labour under as many difficulties as their condition will admit of. We think, therefore, that it wou'd be more eligible to relieve than to increase it by a fresh imposition which might indeed, for the present, produce some addition to the revenue, but in its consequence wou'd probably tend to depopulate the country and considerably affect the interest of the Company and the Zamindars". [2]

From the preceding discussion of zamindari rights and the possible modes of increasing the Company's revenues, it will be clear that some of the most important changes in the revenue administration of the Sarkars, consistently advocated and systematically carried through at a later date, were forestalled and discussed with admirable thoroughness. Such was the thorny nature of these issues that no placing in juxtaposition of the arguments of the Masulipatam Council and the objections of the government would lead us to any clear grasp of the subject. Both of them were wrong in assuming certain premises of their arguments. But, the merits of this discussion lie in the remarkable manner in which the government was able to lay its hands upon certain abuses in the administration of revenue. It is admitted on all hands that if the Company were to establish a stable government and introduce uniformity and equity into its administration of the Sarkars it could best achieve its ends by reducing the zamindars to greater dependance on itself. The ring-fence of a chain of duties in each zamindari was harmful to trade and industry, and until uncertainty and the prevailing confusion were removed and uniformity and moderation of tax-collection established, no security in the country could be established.

But the governments were as yet unwilling to undertake any risks. At best they were only superficially acquainted with internal conditions in the Sarkars and were totally unprepared for any ambitious

1. *Ibid.*

2. Resolution of the Madras government in *Pub. Cons.* 26 November, 1773 Vol. 86, pp. 782-89.

scheme of reforms such as was suggested by Whitehill's Council at Masulipatam. Their first duty, if at all possible of fulfilment, was to protect the rights of the inhabitants. Next, they would do well to conciliate the zamindars and continue them in their customory rights. Since it was admitted that "the Company now receive a high tribute from the Circars dependent upon Masulipatam," any changes introduced with a view to effecting an increase therein would "be considered oppressive or encroaching upon the acknowledged rights and privileges of the Zamindars" by which "the faith and honor of the Company would be severely wounded and the Zamindars themselves readily embrace the first opportunity of shaking off their subjection to our authority".[1]

Consequently, they confirmed the zamindars in the rights enjoyed by them prior to 1766 and declared that any changes introduced "either now or at any future period" could only be through their agency. They directed the Chief of Masulipatam to assist them in the uniform collection of the established duties and prevent imposition and knavery on the part of revenue underlings.[2]

This attitude of the Madras government at once lifted the administration of the revenue affairs from the sphere of controversy and expediency to that of patient investigation and thus prepared the ground in part for the work of later Committee of Circuit. In this connection it must be admitted that Wynch's administration was public-spirited and progressive in their views and steadied any exuberant impulses in the Court of Directors to give full scope to a policy of complete commercialisation of their affairs in India.

In the light of the above discussions, the government decided to conduct a fresh settlement of the three middle Sarkars for another period of three years. They directed Whitehill to proceed to Rajahmundry with as many assistants as he deemed necessary and re-establish individual contacts with the zamindars and settle the *jamabandi*.[2]

Fresh triennial settlement 1773-74 to 1776-77;

In the provision for assistants the Madras government only initiated the general practice of a later date which the collectors of the present-day districts still observe.

The extreme severity of the pravailing drought in the Sarkars rendered Whitehill's task arduous. While continuing the previous rates

1. Resolution of the Madras Government in *Pub. Cons.* 26 November 1773, Vol. 36. pp. 782-89.

See also *Madras Letters Received*. 5 February, 1774 (Wynch) Paras 61-69 Vol. VII.

2. *Masulipatam to Madras*. 31 December, 1773. No. 7 for 1774. *Pub. Cons*, 7 January 1774, and resolution of the government thereon, Vol. 37. pp. 19-26.

3. *Idem* 8 October, 1773, Vol, 36, pp. 747-48.

of *jamabandi*, he prevailed upon the zamindars to surrender to the Company a fifty per cent share in their land customs. Only the zamindars of Kota, Ramachandrapuram and Mailavaram were the exceptions to this surrender since their losses from the adverse seasonal conditions were more extensive than those of their neighbours.[1]

Disturbances in Polavaram.

Whitehill's settlement was marred by an unpleasant incident in Polavaram. On the death of Venkataramala Deva, the raja, the claims of Lakshminarayana Deva, raja of Gutala, as his rightful heir were admitted. But the people of Polavaram were unwilling to accept the candidature of the latter. On the other hand, they pressed for the adoption of Lakshminarayana Deva's son by the widow of Venkataramala Deva and obtained it after a series of complicated negotiations. But the custody of the minor son was the bone of contention between the people of these two zamindaries who seemed to have entertained exaggerated notions of its importance. This tension of feelings resulted in the organised plunder of Polavaram by the adherents of Lakshminarayana Deva. But the Masulipatam Council had not much difficulty in chastising Lakshminarayana Deva and entrusting the child to the care of the widow of Venkataramala Deva. This unhappy incident provoked the Madras government to a definition of their views towards zamindari succession. They resolved that "the company alone assert the right of judging and terminating any disputes which may arise amongst them, and that we shall not fail to make examples of such persons as shall, in defiance of this authority take up arms to decide their own quarrels or disturb the peace of the country under any pretence whatever"[2]

The failure of the Vizagapatam farms and the heaviness of zamindari balances and renters' dues throughout the Sarkars was the occasion of an inquiry into their causes and the adoption of remedial measures. The government found out that the subordinate settlements were unable to exercise vigorous control for the want of any standing rules of administration. To prevent this and to enforce uniformity throughout their possessions they formulated a regulation, the first of its kind at Madras in the XVIII century. It ran as follows:

> "Whenever the stated payments to be made by any zamindar or renter becomes due, the Chief and Council are immediately to demand it; or, if they think it necessary, they may allow him the space of one month to discharge it. But if it be not paid within that time, they are then to acquaint us and to give us the reasons assign'd by such

1. *Whitehill to Madras* Rajahmundry, 11 February 1774. No. 34. *Pub. Cons.* 22 February, and the resolution thereon, Vol. 37. pp. 134—37.

2. *Masulipatam to Madras*, 29 October 1773. No, 119, *Pub. Cons.* 5 November and the resolution of the government thereon, Vol. 36 pp 759—62.

Zamindar or renter for his backwardness, with their opinions upon them. And such other lights as may enable us to judge clearly upon the subject".[1]

Whitehill made steady progress with the realisation of the various kists due from the zamindars.[2] In view of the above noted regulation of the government he gave sufficient time for payments to be made. But the affairs of the Char Mahal and Pethaparam offered him considerable difficulties. Both these zamindaries were more or less in a state of bankruptcy and offered little prospects of freeing themselves from their revenue embarrassments. To make sure of the current revenues Whitehill pursued a novel method. Tirupati Razu raja of Mugalaturru, was granted the management of the Char Mahal for a period of seven years (1774—1780.) He agreed to pay Company's *jamabandi* year by year "whatever it might be", and pay into the Masulipatam treasury a sum of M. Ps. 2,225 every year for the maintenance of the zamindar's family. He was at liberty to recover from the country any debts due to him from the latter and to take a reasonable profit for the risk and trouble of the management.

The Char Mahal and Pithapuram experiments

A similar agreement was reached between Jagapati Razu, raja of Peddapuram and the Company for the management of Pithapuram which was granted to him for a period of eleven years. An allowance of M. Ps. 4,000 a year was set apart for the support of the Rao family of Pithapuram. In justification of this arrangement, Whitehill observed that it was "best calculated for securing the Company's Jamabundy, discharging Juggapettyrauze's debt and relieving the family of their present embarrassment in this favourable time of a minority". The settlement of the Pithapuram affairs was only secured by a show of military pressure.[3] The Madras government were not at all enthusiastic about these two arrangements. The long period of time involved was their objection. They even wished that "any other method could have been fallen upon for satisfying them and at the same time providing for the payment of the Company's money". Still unable to see any alternative, they confirmed Whitehill's arrangements. Jagapati Razu agreed to pay the expenses of the detachment sent to assist his management of the Pithapuram zamindari.[4]

Again in the case of the zamindaries of Gutala, Polavaram, Chintalapudi, Zumalavai, Medur Gattu and Telikancharla, which were

1. *Idem.* 26 November, *idem.* p. 775.

2. *Whitehill to Madras,* Rajahmundry, 13 April, 1774. No. 78. *idem,* 29 April, Vol. 223, pp. 279-92.

3. *Whitehill to Madras,* Rajahmundry, 13 April 1773, No. 78. *Pub. Cons.* 29 April, Vol. 37, pp. 279-92.

4. Resolution of the Madras Government, Vol, 37. pp. 292-95.

greatly distressed, Whitehill accepted Tirupati Razu's security for the payment of the Company's *jamabandi*[1] and gave him "a superintending power" over these districts.

In all these measures, Whitehill was only repeating the experiments which were being made in consolidating the power of Sitarama Razu over the hill-rajas of the Chicacole Sarkar. Expediency and prospective revenue stability were the reasons which produced Whitehill's determination. But he does not seem to have possessed any broad enough vision to perceive the possibility of future complications.

Defects of these experiments

For one thing, no self-respecting zamindar of the times and his more or less turbulent adherents would be willing to remain quite under the tutelage of a neighbouring raja. According to the accepted beliefs of the XVIII century, all rajas belonged to ancient families, possessing equal rights and entitled to equal respect notwithstanding any disparity in the extent of their zamindaries. The super-imposition of the authority of one zamindar over another could at best only end in trouble as the people of Pithapuram clearly demonstrated a few years later to the great peril of the life of Whitehill himself.

Secondly, to tax the capacity of a single zamindar with a variety of interests and responsibilities could only create top heaviness in the management of his revenue business and react upon the efficient administration of the districts entrusted to his charge. Actually Tirupati Razu's affairs were involved in great difficulties within only a short space of time and at one time he actually offered to sacrifice the interests of his own patrimony to discharge his debts to the Company.

Lastly, Whitehill and the government of Madras were unable to recognise the necessity of remissions in the case of really deserving zamindars. At this time, the Company's government was gradually being cleared from an atmosphere surcharged with commercial militarism to that of a more reasoned administration. An earnest of the new conciliatory spirit was offered to the zamindars, but if only a well-timed scheme of remissions had been added to it, many of the later troubles connected with revenue affairs would have been eliminated.

THE FIRST COMMITTEE OF CIRCUIT.

The Regulating Act of 1773 was responsible for a marked change in the conduct of the administration of the affairs of the East India

1. *Masulipatam to Madras*, 16 June. No. 121 *Pub. Cons.* 27 June, Vol. 38, pp. 416-18.

Company. It made it obligatory on the part the Presidencies of Bengal, Madras and Bombay to lay before the authorities at home a detailed analysis of their respective revenues. Not long after the receipt of orders from the Court of Directors, Madras government resolved[1] that "it appears that some inconveniences have arisen from blending......(the business of revenue) with other proceedings of the Civil Department, that connection being frequently broken and interrupted, it is often necessary before a subject can be thoroughly understood, to make a great number of references which not only create trouble and loss of time, but it sometimes happens, notwithstanding the greatest care, that many little circumstances escape notice, and occasion omission which might be easily prevented by a more regular and connected method of conducting business". It was further resolved that the revenue business be conducted by a 'Board of Revenue'[2] and the Proceedings be entitled 'Proceedings of the Board of Revenue'. To facilitate the smooth and efficient working of this scheme a Committee of Four was elected by ballot and appointed to meet once a month or oftener to conduct the business of this department and to maintain an 'Account Current Book'[3] in order that the amounts of balances arising out of the transactions between the Company on the one hand and the zamindars and the renters on the other might be clearly exhibited. Henceforward, a continuity of policy and thoroughness of revenue administration with the attendant benefits to the renters and cultivators such as were so far unknown were to be expected.

Revenue proceedings instituted

The efforts of the government were at this stage beset with great difficulties. With a view to clear the ground for the Committee of Four, they reviewed the existing position of revenue affairs in the Northern Sarkars.[4] The Company's possessions comprising lands 'held by them in absolute right' were found to consist of the *haveli* lands, approximating to a certain extent, to the ancient royal demesne and of zamindari lands held by individuals, with varying rights and status. In both these cases the Company entered into agreements with them on a mixed tributary and lease basis and as such no direct contact between the former and actual cultivators was possible. The zamindars were found to be a puzzling type. Some of them were

Difficulties of the Government

1. *Rev. Cons.* 18 August, 1774. Vol. 17. p. 1.

2. This Board must not be confused with the Board of Revenue as such created on 1 August 1786 during the administration of Sir Archibald Campbell.

3. *Idem.* 26 August, p. 5.

4. Vol. 17. pp. 5-25.

'hereditary landowners', tracing their origin to comparatively remote periods. Others were self-created territorial proprietors who came into existence during the troublous times that followed the break of the Bahamani Kingdom and the Mughal Empire. But both these classes were equally obstinate and "often refused obedience until compelled by force" which at times resulted in their expulsion from their zamindaries. "The government found the attachment of the people to the Zamindars so strong that they could seldom collect any part of the revenues and in general they rather chose to give the lands to one of the family than to annex them to the Crown". Forcible occupation were never contemplated. All that was done was to 'secure a reasonable tribute' settled with the individual zamindars and the renters in general. The system of leases, generally for periods of three or five years, more often the former, was found convenient. A principle of graduation of annual payments in the ascending order was unconsciously adopted, and the 'medium' [1] was generally recognised as the standard for revenue transactions. This system, presumably, worked smoothly as far as it obtained, in as much as the lower initial payment was capable of being augmented considerably by the time the leases expired, on account of the possibility of an increased attention to and grasp of detail by the contracting parties of the agricultural conditions. This feature led to the unavoidable presence of balances outstanding in the Company's accounts, while the principle of continuity of management as seen in the convenient re-appointment of a renter was gradually instituted. The tentative arrangements recognising Hussain Ali Khan as the chief renter of the Company's southern possessions and allowing Sitarama Razu to mediate for the revenues of the Chicacole zamindars were given up, and "the Board[2] thought it expedient to try the mode of settling with the Zamindars without the intervention of a renter, and the experiment succeeded beyond all expectations".

Paucity of material, in spite of the accounts of the subordinate settlements, hampered the activities of the Company "to prevent the people from being oppressed and to secure to them all their just rights and privileges, for industry is the natural effect of security". To obviate this difficulty, the duties of the Committee of Four were clearly defined. They were to meet as frequently as occassion demanded. Something like agricultural census was to be attempted. The Committee was directed to assertain the value of the lands, their

1. The medium finds its parallel in Akbar's *mahsūl*. See the present writer's brochure, *Mughal Land Revenue System*. pp. 25. The Basheer Muslim Library, Woking, England 1929.

2. The Board here referred to is the Madras Council which was customarily called by that name.

capacity for improvement, the mode of division of crops and the realisation of the assessment. They were to "draw out an account of the several divisions of the home farms", [1] specifying the chief towns and villages dependent on the various *cusbas* or chiefships, the number of houses, the nature of the soil, whether watered by tanks or *pikotas*,[2] the number of tanks and water courses, the expenses required to put them into proper condition, the prospective advantages to be derived from such constructive undertakings the proportion of cultivated to uncultivated land, and the like. Likewise was an industrial census enjoined with a view to facilitate the commercial activities of the Company. Further, the Committee were asked to make a historical inquiry into the position of the *srotriam* and *inam* lands. A minute investigation was cautiously avoided, but the Chiefs and Councils of the subordinate settlements were instructed to furnish detailed accounts-current of revenue, with their views on the probable effects of a fragmentation of individual holdings under the management of renters from whose 'want of responsibilty' the Company 'frequently suffered'. Particular emphasis was laid upon the independent 'further enquiries' of the Company's servants in supplying this information explanatory to the accounts of the *sheristadars, mujumdars, deshmukhs* and the *deshpandyas*. All this was anticipatory of the terms of reference to the Committee of Circuit which was appointed a year later.

Reports of the Committee of Revenue

This Committee submitted its first report on 1 December 1774, which dealt with the accounts-current of the various districts belonging to the Company.[3] After carefully comparing their information with the oral and written evidence and accounts of the zamindars and renters, the Committee dilated upon the imperfections in the dealings of various subordinate Chiefs and Councils with the farms of revenue in general. Extracts from this report were sent to the chiefships concerned for their explanation. This may be regarded as the first instance of a system of audit of the revenue accounts fully developed at a considerably later date in the Madras Presidency.

The inquiry or rather the survey ordered by the Madras Council occasioned a certain amount of suspicion on the part of the renters as well as the cultivators. The Committee were not satisfied with the accounts supplied by the Chief and Council of Masulipatam and deemed them "insufficient to enable us to judge of their real

1. Corresponding to the *khalsa* of the Muhammadan regime. Same as the *haveli*.

2. *Pikota* is one of the principal instruments in lift irrigation. See Maclean s. v. Vol. III. p. 682.

3. *Rev. Cons.* Vol. 17. pp. 169-177.

value",[1] while they expressed their surprise at the fears of the inhabitants who appear to be so much interested in every kind of improvement of the lands, that we cannot conceive why an enquiry of this kind should afford them any real grounds of suspicion".[2] At this stage George Mackey, a member of the government submitted a reasoned minute deprecating short leases.[3] He raised seven points dealing with the advisability of adopting a system of long leases, He would encourage the Company's servants to rent lands, bring zamindari agreements into assonance with those relating to the *haveli* lands, and synchronise both for purposes of administrative convenience. He would prohibit the acceptance of *nazars* on pain of suspension from office, and issue public advertisement in English and Telugu calling in revenue offers. He finally advocated the abolition of inland duties and recommended the appointment of a committee to circuit the Company's *jagir*[4] and the Northern Sarkars. All these proposals were approved with the exception of the last for which the existing conditions were deemed unpropitious[5] "Upon a comparative view of the affairs......the Board observe with concern that the offers for five years fall short of the late rents upwards of 7,000 pagodas per annum, and they observe also that the offers upon the increased term of eight and ten years even do not come up to those rents". This was evidently due to the reflex effects of the stir caused by the proposed inquiry. "The offers are in general inadequate to the value of the farms" and all except three, of which one was that of an European renter, were rejected. At the same time the farms for which the proposals were rejected were to be managed "immediately on ... [the Company's] own account", until the results of the survey ordered to be conducted by Mr. Scott of the Masulipatam farms became available.

The Committee submitted its second report on 21 July 1775.[6] As far as the Sarkars were concerned, the findings of the Committee indicated a very unfavourable situation. Large balances were outstanding in the Company's accounts. Most of the renters and zamindars under Vizagapatam who owed them were dispossessed of their

1. *Masulipatam to Madras,* 18 April 1775. *Rev. Cons.* 3 May, Vol. 17 A pp. 162—163. Again Masulipatam wrote that on account of the intricacy and excessive tediousness of the Ellore accounts......it would not be in our power to perfect, the enquiry you have directed". *Same to same.* 7 August, idem. 18 August idem. pp. 418.

2 *Idem.* pp. 171-172.

3. *Idem.* pp. 167-176.

4. At this period the *jagir* consisted of the lands round Madras forming part of the present Chingleput District.

5. *Rev. Cons.* 6 June, 1775 Vol. 17-A. pp. 200-218.

6. *Rev. Cons.* 21 July, Vol. 17-A. pp. 340-48.

lands. The balances under Masulipatam "appear to us very considerable and we therefore represent them to you that you may issue such orders as may appear to you necessary upon the occasion...... For the regular keeping of the books account-current of Zamindars and renters, it is necessary that it be the province of one person". The Madras Council circularised the Chiefs and Councils of Vizagapatam and Masulipatam with the above findings, while Mr. Hoissard was appointed to the charge of the accounts-current with the zamindars and renters.

Appointment of the Circuit Committee

The appointment of the Committee of Circuit is memorable in more ways than one. So far, matters relating to revenue were dealt with in the most casual manner possible. The subordinate chiefships conducted the revenue business at first in the public consultations and then in the military consultations and sometimes in both. It was not till 1774 that the revenue business was clearly separated from the military and commercial undertakings and a series of revenue consultations started. The appointment of the Circuit Committee resulted in accelerating this attempt for a departmental origanisation of the ever-increasing volume of the revenue business and not only provided for continuity of policy but also systematised the revenue methods.

Previous to the appointment of the Circuit Committee, the Chiefs and Councils of the subordinate settlements had not access to detailed, and authentic local information necessary to give them a regular, definite and real grasp of the position of the agriculturists and the capacity of the country to yield an adequate and reasonable revenue for which there was an ever-growing demand on the part of the Company with their increased responsibility and enlarged field of activities. Small wonder that they were at the mercy of the few who understood the English language and were entitled to their confidence. It was essentially an age of *dubash* tyranny. The cases of Kandregula Jogi Pantulu, Venkatarayulu and Jaggappa on the one hand and of Bala Krishna Naidu on the other are instances in point. Next to these 'interpreters' came the select group of the landed aristocracy who had the wherewithal to parade their capacity to rent lands for a consideration. What the Company at this period wanted was an adequate security for the regular payment of the much needed revenue, and this the mixed type of landed proprietors, otherwise indifferently called zamindars, were seen to provide most often with the collateral security of *sahukar* bills. But the *dubash*, by the nature of his appointment which was often coupled with that of a renter of the Company's *haveli* lands, was a potential instrument for double-dealing and oppression, while the demonstrations of some of the prospective renters were frequently deceptive. The

latter fact may be illustrated by the enormous balances invariably remaining in the credit columns of the Company's accounts. Even the large estates, say of Vijayanagaram and Pithapuram, were not sufficient guarantees for the regular payment of the Company's dues. The period prior to this important event was essentially one of revenue speculation, both on the part of the Company's servants, and the prospective renters, in as much as neither of them had the means or the social standing sufficient to inspire confidence and obtain a specific knowledge of the condition of the husbandmen, the capacity of the land, the state of irrigational facilities, the effect of the seasons on the crops and the like, not to speak of the question of land tenures. The situation was aggravated by the fact that most of the renters were privateers possessing the Company's favour without the advantages of local knowledge. What was looked for was the assurance of an agreement for an appreciable amount of revenue reinforced by a guarantee for its punctual payment. Obviously, such a variable mode of revenue speculation could not have produced a just system of revenue assessment and collection. The orders for the appointment of the Circuit Committee were conceived to relieve the disastrous effects of such a process susceptible of modulation from year to year.

The appointment of the Circuit Committee was ordered by the Court of Directors in their dispatch of 12 April 1775.[1] It was to consist of 'a committee of our Council', meaning thereby the Madras Council which was "to acquire a complete knowledge of the territories which have been granted to the Company on the Coast of Coramandel and establish a judicious and permanent system for their future management". They were to "ascertain with all possible exactness the produce of the countries, the number of inhabitants, the state of manufactures, the fortified places, the gross amount of the revenues, the articles from which they arose, and the mode by which they are collected, charges of collection, the specific proportion usually received by the Rajah or Zamindar, and that which custom or usage has allotted to the cultivator as reward of his labour. They are particularly to enquire what security...(the latter) has for his property, what courts there are for the administration of justice and how far similar regulations to those lately established at Bengal by our President and Council there may with propriety be introduced into the Northern Circars". "The impropriety of suffering any Zamindar to become a formidable neighbour or too powerful cannot admit of a doubt...

1. *Madras Dispatches.* Vol. 6. pp. 372-98. It is, quite probable that this measure of the Court of Directors was prompted by the decision of the Madras government in appointing the Committee of Four, as there was sufficient time for the former to, receive the Madras advices announcing the same before they proceeded with the appointment of the Circuit Committee.

In order to enable us to strike at the root of this evil, the Committee of Circuit must take the most effectual means for ascertaining the strength of each Rajah, Zamindar or Landholder in the Circars, the expense of his household and that of his troops, the means he may have of defraying such expenses, and the number of regular troops which it will be necessary for us to maintain in the respective districts in order to keep them in due subjection... (to maintain which the tribute remitted to our treasury at Fort St. George be nevertheless considerably increased. We are therefore resolved that every military man in the Circars shall be absolutely under our own command, obliged to serve us whenever he may be wanted". If any of the zamindars relinquish their hereditary claims, we have no objection to allow them such stipends as shall be found reasonable in lieu of the benefits arising from their Zamindaries. "It is by no means our wish to deprive the hereditary Rajahs or Zamindars of their annual incomes; on the contrary, we mean to secure it to them without the necessity of keeping up an armed force to compel payment thereof and it is our earnest desire to deliver the inhabitants, so far as may be in our power, from undue exaction and oppression". Finally, the Committee were to lease out the lands for a period of years, at their own discretion, on the expiry of the existing agreements.

The unfortunate administration of Lord Pigot, which resulted in his ultimate imprisonment by the majority of the Madras Council, impeded the immediate appointment of the Circuit Committee so definitely insisted upon by the Court of Directors. Notwithstanding the spirited protest of Sir Robert Fletcher,[1] the obstinacy of Lord Pigot who pleaded the urgency of the Tanjore affairs and the impossibility of sparing senior servants to serve on the Committee, protracted the quarrels among the members of the Madras Council to a disproportionate extent. During the course of this unfortunate affairs,[2] Francis Jourdon, a senior member of the Council who saw service to the northward, minuted:[3] "I know of no other circumstance in the present situation of our affairs that can justify longer delay in carrying on these orders of the Company for the Circuit into execution; on the contrary, the rents of the farms are continued for one year and the

1. *Rev. Cons*, 28 June, 1776. Vol. 18. p. 162.

2. See *idem*. 26 July, and 1, 2 August, 5 and 9 August *idem*. pp. 180—82; 206 213; 217-218; 223-26; and 257-68 respectively. For a vivid narrative of Lord Pigot's career, See Love : *Vestiges* III, pp. 84-122. For a narrative of the personal animosities between the members of the Madras Council see *Lord Pigot's Narrative of the late Revolution in the Government of Madras*, with marginal notes by Alexander Dalrymple, India Office Library, No. 4. p. 20.

3. *Rev. Cons*, 26 July, Vol. 18, pp. 180—82.

mode tends evidently to distress the inhabitants in those districts. The Zamindars likewise must be managed in the same manner. The Zamindars will be discouraged from improvement in the apprehension of an increase of tribute and this mode, injurious as it may be, cannot be altered until the Committee obtain full and perfect information of the real value of the lands. The Circars are capable of great improvements...These are the objects of government (*sic*) and which if well attended to will give confidence, wealth and happiness to the people and increase the revenues of the government and, these are the objects entrusted to the care of the Committee." Spurred to action by this spirited minute, the majority in Council, [1] appointed the Committee of Circuit on 11th October 1776. [2] consisting of Samuel Johnson, Charles Floyer, John Holland, Peter Perring and Quintin Craufurd, the Committee were ordered to investigate in the first instance the revenues of the Chicacole *pargana*. [3]

Duties of the Circuit Committee.

Early in the period of the disagreement between the members of the Madras Council, attempts had been made to define the scope of the work of the Circuit Committee on the basis of the instructions of the Court of Directors. Alexander Dalrymple, the future author of the *Oriental Repertory*, then a member of the Council, prepared an elaborate list of the duties of, and the procedure to be adopted by the Committee.[4] His clear enunciation of the *modus operandi* to be profitably adopted, which consisted of the detailing of individual members of the Committee assisted by junior servants to localise their investigations in the different parts of the Sarkars and after collating their work in Committee to proceed with the leasing out of the lands, did not evoke the consideration it merited. Lord Pigot was suspended on 25 August 1776 and instructions were issued to the Circuit Committee on 31 October,[5] under the signature of George Stratton who was elected President by the majority in Council.

1. The majority minute was signed by George Stratton, Sir Thomas Fletcher, Charles Floyer, Henry Brooke, Archdale Palmer, Francis Jourdan and George Mackay.

Madras to Vizagapatam. 11 October, Vol. 18. p. 356.

3. The committee originally named by the Court of Directors consisted of George Dawson, Claud Russel, Alexander Dalrymple, Samuel Johnson and George Mackey. See *Madras Dispatches* (Revenue) 12 April 1775, para 35. Vol 6. p. 397. But owing to official and personal difficulties, the original Committee as such could not proceed as a body. It is significant to note that the appointment of junior servants was mostly disastrous. Almost all of them were found guilty of peculation during later investigations. It is equally conspicioous to note that the members of the original Committee were exactly of the opposite character.

Rev. Cons. 29 July, Vol. 18, pp. 191 ff.

Madras to Circuit Committee. 31 October, *idem*. pp, 375—82.

Put briefly, the Circuit Committee were ordered to investigate the best possible way of increasing the Company's revenues [1]. To supply authentic and detailed information about the state of existing affairs was a secondary charge. Not a single point was missed. From examination of the position of the formidable military strength of the Raja of Vijayanagaram to an enquiry into the necessity of building a residence for the Paymaster of Aska,—such was the scope of their activities. A certain latitude of action was granted to them and they were urged to conduct the inquiry "in the most expeditious and effectual manner possible". All the records of the Company's subordinate settlements were put at their disposal, and the persons employed in the survey of the lands were detailed to assist them in every way.

The Committee were asked to examine into the validity of the claims for an abatement of revenue by Jagannadha Razu and Jaggabandhu Chaudhari, rents of the Company's *haveli* lands in the Chicacole and Ichchapur *parganas* respectively and by Sitarama Razu, *diwan* to and elder brother of the Raja of Vijayanagaram. They were further to report on the advisability of converting the smaller and heavily encumbered zamindaries into the Company's *haveli* with suitable *jagirs* provided for the maintenance of the sequestrated zamindari families. But "we do not mean upon any account to take away from the Zamindars their hereditary rights". Means were to be recommended for reducing the price of salt. Octroi and other zamindari duties which was harmful to industry and commerce were to be minutely investigated into with a view to their total abolition, as well as the validity of the innumerable grants for lands in the possession of cultivators which exempted them from paying rent to the Company in one way or another. This practically amounted to an historical inquiry into the question of land tenures. Finally, the instructions were rounded off with the following remarkable passage: [2] "The increase of cultivation and of population, the increase of the wealth of individuals and of revenue to government are so connected with each other, that in the investigation entrusted to you, every day will throw new light upon the information of the preceding day. We rely upon the exertion of your endeavours in the execution of this important business, and we shall therefore only add that much will depend on impressing the minds of the people with confidence in our government and securing to the industrious the produce of their labour."

1. For a clear account of the duties of the Circuit Committee see *Madras Letters Received* (Revenue) 14 October 1775 (Wynch) Vol. 7. Complaining of the chaotic condition of the revenue affairs in the Sirkars, to rectify which the Circuit Committee were appointed, Madras wrote home: "The rights of the Government have been sacrificed and the privileges of the inhabitants violently encroached upon". *Idem*, para. 5,

2. Para 21 of the Instructions.

The appointment of the Circuit Committee did not immediately secure the avowed objects of the majority of the Council which shortly after arrested and imprisoned Lord Pigot, as they at once proceeded to abandon the principles on which they had appeared to fight. On the recommendation of the Masulipatam Council,[1] they let the lands for a term of two years under the impression that such an act would not only allay popular apprehensions but also facilitate the Circuit Committee's work, and thus within less than a fortnight of the revolution, the policy which they so vigorously enunciated was completely reversed.

After the completion of preliminary investigations of the Vizagapatam records, the Circuit Committee requested[2] a copy of the report of the Bengal Committee of Circuit, which had been appointed considerably earlier,[3] with a view to enquire into precedents and assess their applicability to the conditions prevailing in the Northern Sarkars. The original committee of Four still continued to function, and on 14 January 1777 they furnished a report[4] based on a detailed analysis of the Company's revenues from the various *paraganas* of the Sarkars. This curious parallelism in the functions and investigations of the two Committees is not clearly explicable.

Reports of the Circuit Committee

The Circuit Committee were compelled to plunge at once into the tangled morass of Vizianagaram politics which came to a climax at this period. The jealousis between Viziarama Razu, the Raja of Vizianagaram, and his aggrieved elder brother, Sitarama Razu, whose claims to the Zamindari had been overlooked, reached a point at which no orderly government of the vast tracts of land under their joint control was possible. Jagannadha Razu, the *diwan* of Vijayarama Razu and the renter of the Company's *haveli* lands in the Chicacole Circar, was imprisoned by the Vizagapatam Council for his alleged contumacy in aiding Rajanna Dora, a rebel chief in the

1. *Masulipatam to Madras*. 21 November 1776. *Rev. Cons.* 4 December. Vol. 18 pp. 430 ff. Charles Floyer who was a member of the Circuit Committee and who later became notorious for his acts of misappropriation of public revenues, was the Chief of Masulipatam at this time. See also *Madras Letters Received* (Revenue) 6 February 1777. 4 (Stratton) Vol. 8. pp. 244-45.

2. *Circuit Committee to Madras*, 20th December 1776. *idem* 31 December. *idem*. p. 495.

3. The Bengal Report was not at all supplied to the Circuit Committee. See *Report of the Circuit Committee* 10 September, 1777. para. 24. *idem*. 18 November, Vol. 19. p. 653.

4. Interim Report signed by Brooke and Jourdan dated Fort St. George 14 January 1777, *Rev. Cons.* 17 January, Vol. 19 pp. 14-17.

East Godavari District.[1] The Madras government took strong exception to this and wrote to Vizagapatam.[2] "As we have already recommended to the Chiefs and Councils in the Circars to keep upon the best terms possible with the several Zamindars and to maintain them in their respective rights and privileges, we are much concerned at the steps you had taken to confine Jaggernautrauze without the charge being proved against him. For being Duan to Vizeram rauze he should have been imprisoned through him for the claim laid to his charge." Viyanarama Razu protested at this obvious encroachment on his just rights and refused to proceed to Madras as was ordered by the Vizagapatam Council.[3] Instead, he rescued Jagannadha Razu from the custody of the Company's troops, and not only made him a prisoner for a second time but also abetted his brother Sitarama Razu in imprisoning and torturing Jagga Rao, the Company's interpreter at Vizagapatam.[4] Notwithstanding the protests of the Circuit Committee[5] and the demand by the Madras government for the release of Jagannadha Razu,[6] he put Vijayanagaram in a state of defence and collecting 25,000 troops threatened hostilities with a view openly to assert his rights[7]. He was further believed to be in league with the Marathas.[8] The disputes between the Vizagapatam Council and Capt. Murphy, the officer commanding the Company's troops in the Chicacole Sarkar, were protracted till 19 July 1777 [9], when at the request of the former, reinforcements were sent under Capt. Collins from

1. *Vizagapatam to Madras*, 27 February, 1777. *Milit Cons.* 10 March, Vol. 83 pp. 319-28. In this Jagannadha Razu was supposed to have had the support of his erstwhile enemy Sitarama Razu. The records for this period dealing with the Vijayanagaram family seem to be very much confused. It was the same Jagannadha Razu, who was later recommended by the Circuit Committee to the Muzumdari of the Chicacole Sarkar. See. Infra......

2. *Madras to Vizagapatam*. 2 May, *idem.* pp. 655-56.

3. *Vizagapatam to Madras* 17 April, *Milit Cons.* 28 April Vol. 83. p. 635 and Vol. 84. p. 636.

4. *Same to same.* 30 June and 1 July. *idem.* 14 July. *idem.* pp. 996-98 and 999 respectively; see also *same to same*, 5 and 30 June, *Rev. Cons.* 17 July, Vol. 19. pp. 285-305; See further *Madras letters Received*, 18 September, 1777 (Whitehill) paras. 9-11. Vol. 8. pp. 363-65.

5. *Circuit Committee to Vijayarama Razu*, dated Chicacole 28 June, in *Circuit Committee to Madras*, 5th July. *Rev. Cons.* 1 August. Vol. 19. pp. 480-82.

6. *Madras to Vizagapatam* (military) 14 July, Vol. 84. pp. 1013-14.

7. *Vizagapatam to Madras*. 8 and 9 July. *Milit. Cons.* 21 July. *idem.* pp. 1030-32.

8. *Vizagapatam to Madras*, 8 and 9 July, *Milit Cons.* 21 July, Vol. 84 pp. 1030-32.

9. For the correspondence between the Vizagapatam Council and Capt. Murphy, over the powers of the Company's military officers in relation to those of the civil servants, see *idem*, 21 *July idem*, pp. 1033 50.

Masulipatam and Cap. Cheshyre from Ganjam.[1] Roused at last to a sense of the gravity of the situation the incapable Vijayarama Razu recalled the detachment of a thousand troops sent to the aid of Rajanna Dora, sent in *tins* for Rs. 1,22,666 and promised to pay the remaining balance to the Company in a short time. But Jagannadha Raju's life was still in danger since by this time the ascendency of Sitarama Razu over his weakling brother was supreme. Samuel Johnson, Chief of Vizagapatam deputed Quintin Crauford, a member of his Council, and the Company's *dubash* to conclude a speedy settlement with Vijayarama Razu.[2] Madras condemned this proceeding as calculated "to degrade the authority of the Company"[3] while the mission itself failed in that Vijayarama Razu refused to deliver Jagannadha Razu into the custody of the Company.[4]

Even though Jagannadha Razu was released almost immediately afterwards,[5] Sir Edward Hughes was asked to provide two ships to carry troops and stores to Vizagapatam[6] and on the minute of General Stuart the Madras Council resolved to garrison the fort of Vijayanagaram.[7] Jagannadha Razu still remained at large,[8] and ran the risk of being again kidnapped.[9] Further reinforcements were ordered to Vizagapatam,[10] Masulipatam was directed to defray the expenses of the expedition,[11] and Col. Braithwaite placed in charge of the operations,[12] Vijayarama Razu was ordered[13]

1. See correspondence in *idem.* 5 August, *idem.* pp. 1139-60.
2. *Vizagapatam to Madras*, 23 July, *idem.* 5 August, *idem.* 1160-63
3. *Madras to Vizagapatam*, 5 August, *idem.* pp. 1163-66.
4. *Vizagapatam to Madras*, 28 July, *idem.* 8 August *idem.* pp. 1173 to 86.
5. *Vizagapatam to Madras* (supplemental) 28 July, Vol. 84. p. 1186.
6. *Idem.* p. 1188.
7. He was supported by the President George Stratton, Charles Floyer and Francis Jourdan. Charles Mackay, who was former Chief of Vizagapatam, requested in vain for an inquiry into the conduct of the Vizagapatam Council and into the intrigues of a John Douglas and his *dubash* (who was recently appointed the Company *dubash* at Vizagapatam in succession to Jagga Rao) in fomenting discussions between the Vizagapatam Council and Vijayrama Razu, and thus give the Rajah an opportunity to justify his conduct. See *Milit. Cons.* 11 August, *idem.* pp, 1192 to 1204, Strangely enough, the Court of Directors, approved the conduct of General Stuart, See *Madras Dispatches* 14 April 1779. Vol. 8. pp. 368-77.
8. *Vizagapatam to Madras.* 19 July, *idem.* 11 August, Vol. 84 pp. 1209—12.
9. *Same to same* (supplemental) 29 and 31 July. *idem.* 11 August, *idem.* pp.1212-18.
10. *Madras to Sir Edward Hughes.* 11 August *idem* pp. 1119-20.
11. *Milit Cons.* 12 August, *idem.* pp. 1121-22. Mackay again vainly pleaded for the postponement of aggressive measures.
12. *Madras to Vizagapatam*, 15 August, *idem.* pp. 1225-31, and instructions to Col. Braithwaite. *idem.* pp. 1231-37.
13. *Madras to Vijayarama*, idem. pp. 1237 44.

to remove all his effects from Vijayanagaram, to look to Madras for future instructions, to account for the "indignity and insult offered to this government and for the impediments thrown in the way of the Circuit Committee,[1] to appoint with the consent of Sitarama Razu an heir to the Zamindari, to deliver the fort of Vijayanagram to Col. Braithwaite within twenty-four hours' notice; and, finally to proceed to Madras for a new revenue settlement. Vijayarama Razu protested in vain against his ill-treatment by the Vizagapatam Council[2] and surrendered on 17 August 1777[3]. Sitarama Razu fled from Vijayanagaram the very next day, and the Vizagapatam Council recommended his imprisonment inasmuch as his flight with his family effects constituted an act of criminality and as "his ambition could only be equalled by his avarice."[4] Communicating the whole transaction to Warren Hastings, the Whitehill government observed[5] that the preceding Stratton government had taken such severe steps "thinking this a favourable opportunity for reducing the increased power of Vizeramrauze which has long been an object of jealousy to the Company."

1. The Circuit Committee, strongly complained of the impediments thrown in the way of their inquiries by Vijayarama Razu, who refused them access to the village accountants, See *Circuit Committee to Madras*, 5 July, *Rev. Cons.* 1 August, Vol. 19. pp. 480-82.

2. *Vijayarama Razu to Madras* in *Milit Cons*. 18 August, Vol. 85, p. 1274. The Razu's letter was not dated.

3. *Vizagapatam to Madras*. 20 August, *idem*. 4 September, *idem*. pp. 1340-43, and enclosures, pp. 1344-57. A narrative of the incidents is supplied in *same to same* of 30 August, *idem*. 9 September pp. 1382-93, and the numerous enclosures which constitute Braithwaite's correspondence with the Vizagapatam council and contain copies of the *sanads* given by Viziarama Razu to Jagannadha Razu are to be found on pp. 1394-1427.

"In justice to Vizeramrauze", the Madras government wrote home that he formally submitted to the Chief of Vizagapatam before the arrival of the European detachments. See *Madras Letters Received*, 15 October, para 3. (Whitehill) Vol. 8 pp. 432-33.

4. *Milit Cons*. 4 September, Vol. 85. pp. 1340-43.

5. *Madras to Bengal* (military) 19 September, Vol, 85. pp. 1340-43.

The Whitehill government further wrote to the Court of Directors; "Viziaramrauze's power appears long to have been an object of apprehension to this government. and his Jammabundy or tribute to the Company has on that account been rated much lower in proportion (*sic*) than that of the other Zamindars. To strike at the root of this evil without forcibly dispossessing him of his lands or involving the Company in the inconveniences of a war, was an act of moderation and prudence which cannot fail of operating (*sic*) to your advantage in whatever light it is considered." *Madras Letters Received*, 19 September, 1777, para 11, Vol. 8, p. 365.

(To be continued)

THE SURAPURAM CHIEFS AND SOME SANSKRIT WRITERS PATRONISED BY THEM

APPENDIX

DR. V. RAGHAVAN

In the last issue of this journal, I dealt with the history of the chiefs of Surapuram or Shorapur and the geneology and works of a S'rīvaiṣṇava family of authors patronised by the Surapuram chiefs. I had given in that paper an analysis of a kaifit in Telugu preserved among the Mackenzie mss. called the genealogy of the chiefs of Surapuram, Surapurarājulavams'āvalī.

In Mack. Mss. 15—6—43, my friend Mr. Venkataramiah informs me, we have the following information noted in the diary for August 1819 by Venkata Rao, the assistant of Mackenzie. Venkata Rao says here under date 24th Aug. 1819 that he obtained an account of the genealogy of the Surapuram chiefs from the work *Vēṅkaṭa vilāsa* which Kavīs'vara Rāghavācārlu was writing upon Vēṅkaṭappa nāyaka, the then ruling chief of Surapuram. This shows us the source of the kaifit analysed in my previous article (see p. 23).

This Veṅkaṭappa nāyaka is the 25th and last to be described in the Surapurārājulavams'āvalī (see p. 29 of my previous article); he was the eldest son of Piḍināyaka and became chief in A. D. 1818, when he was thirty five years old.

The Diarist Venkata Rao also adds that for certain details about Pāmināyaka, son of Ramaṇappa nāyaka and grandson of Bahiri Pītāmbara nāyaka, he consulted verses in the works Viṣṇu purāṇa and Bhārgava purāṇa. This Pāmi referred to here has been described by me in the article on p. 27, and it is he who brought from Bukkapaṭṭanam, our authors Aṇṇayācārya and Cinnaya (S'rīnivāsācārya) for administering the Mudrā to him.

SOME MORE WORKS OF THE SURAPURAM WRITERS

Of *S'rīnivāsa Dīkṣita II*, son of S'rīnivāsa Tātārya I and younger brother of Aṇṇaya II and pupil of Kauṇḍinya S'rīnivāsa, and his works, I have spoken on pp. 12-14 of my previous article. He appears to have written a work named *Harimaṇi darpaṇa*, a ms. of which, is available in Madras Govt. Oriental Mss. Library and whose description will appear in the forthcoming Triennial Catalogue

of the Library. The author quotes his own Bhēdadarpaṇa in this work.

One of the Venkaṭācāryas of this family wrote a criticism of Gadādhara (see p. 17 of my previous article). That work may be the Gadādhariya-prāmāṇya-vāda khaṇḍana of Surapuram Veṅkaṭācārya noted on p. 102-b of part 2 of the Adyar Catalogue.

On pp. 17–18 of my previous paper, I noticed *Bucci Veṅkaṭācārya* or *Veṅkaṭācārya IV*, the third son of Aṇṇaya II and his works. This Bucci Veṅkaṭācārya IV has written a stōtra called *Indōh Aṣṭōttaraśatastōtra* (इन्दो: अष्टोत्तरशतस्तोत्र) of which there is a ms. in the Telugu Academy, Cocanada (ms. on 4073 (c)).

A STUDY OF THE GRANTS OF THE EARLY GĀṄGAS.

M. SOMASEKHARA SARMA

All the copper plate grants of the Eastern Gāṅgas of Kaḷiṅga are not of the same type. Many differences are found in the drafting of these grants. These differences admit of their classification into two groups. The special features of the two groups of grants, A & B that distinguish one from the other, may be noted thus·

The 'A' group of grants

i. Do not furnish any mythological account of the Gāṅga dynasty. They furnish only the formal *praśasti* of the Gāṅga Kings ;

ii. Generally mention the names of the donor and his father. They rarely provide the pedigree for three generations;

iii. Generally do not give the date of the grant. When they do, they mention some years in *tens* and *hundreds*, in *figures* or *words*, or *in both*. The years are preceded by a particular kind of phraseology which went on developing in accordance with the increase in years. It reads as follows. "Years of the victorious reign" (*Vijaya rājya-vatsarāh*); "Years of the augmenting victorious reign" (*pravardhamāna vijayarājya saṁvatsarāh*), "Years of the Gāṅga dynasty" (*Gāṅgēya-vaṁśa-saṁvatsarāh*), "years of the augmenting victorious reign of the Gāṅga dynasty" (*Gāṅgēya-vaṁśa-pravardhamāna - vijayarājya-saṁvatsarāh*) and "Years of the augmenting victorious reign of the Gāṅga-Kadamba dynasty" (*Gāṅga-Kadamba-vaṁśa-pravardhamāna-vijayarājya-saṁvatsarāh*").

The dates in the grants so far discovered range from the *Year 39* to the *Year 528*.[1] In between these two dates many early Gāṅga records have yet to be discovered to make the consecutive serial number complete. Scholars are of the opinion that these years refer to an *era* which commenced with the rule of the Early Gāṅgas in the Kaḷiṅga Country and hence they call them *Years of the Gāṅga Era*. (G. E.)

iv. Were issued by kings whose names generally end in *varman* like Indravarman, Hastivarman, Dēvēndravarman, Anantavarman, Sāmantavarman and Rājēndravarman etc.

1. *J. B. O. R. S.* XVIII, pp. 272 ff, *J. A. H. R. S.* VIII, 180-182

Some of the grants mention their father's names like Guṇārṇava, Kāmārṇava and Dānārṇava etc.

On the other hand, the 'B' group of grants provide

i. The mythological account of the Gāṅga dynasty;

ii. A long pedigree of the Gāṅga Kings running into many generations, stating also the periods of rule of different kings;

iii. The date of the grant in Śaka years with adequate astronomical details for verification besides furnishing the date of the coronation of some of the kings;

iv. Names like Dānārṇava, Guṇārṇava, Kāmārṇava and Raṇārṇava etc in the early pedigree of the Gāṅgas prior to Anantavarman-Vajrahasta who is said to have been crowned in A. D. 1038. No names ending in *varman* are found in these grants.

Those who issued grants forming the first group are termed as the EARLY GĀṄGAS while the donors of the other group of records beginning with Anantavarman-Vajrahasta are known as the LATER GĀṄGAS. The reign of Vajrahasta whose coronation date is A. D. 1038 is a landmark which divides the two groups. The only common feature in both the groups is the mention of names of writers and engravers of grants, occasionally with the names of their fathers.

Since the initial year of the Gāṅga era is yet in dispute, and some of the early Gāṅga records are undated and no pedigree of the early kings is furnished by the grants, the relative positions of the early Gāṅga kings in their genealogical and chronological schemes have yet to be settled. An attempt is here made to settle these points from internal evidence furnished by the grants themselves, that is, mainly with the help of the *praśasti* or the formal preamble, of the names of the writers and engravers of grants and of the years in and terminology of the Gāṅga era.

The first king is Indravarman who had the title *Tri-Kaliṅgādhipati* (lord of Tri-Kaliṅga). His Jirjingi plates are dated in the 39th year of the Gāṅga era.[1]

The next grant till now known after the Jirjingi plates of Indravarman is the Narasingapalli plates [2] of Hastivarman, dated in 79 G. E.

Very recently I was able to secure another Early Gāṅga record a grant of king Sāmantavarman who issued it from *Saumyavana* in the year 64, presumably of the Gāṅga era.

1. *Ep. Ind.* XXV, pp. 281 ff; *J. A. H. R. S, III* pp. 49 ff.
2. *Ep. Ind.* XXIII, pp. 62 ff; Bhārati.

Considerable difference can be noted in the *praśastis* recorded in the first three Gāṅga grants of Indravarman, Sāmantavarman and Hastivarman respectively. For easy reference I give below the *praśasti* recorded in the grants of both Indravarman and Sāmantavarman.

Indravarman's grant :—

'अमरपुरप्रतिस्पर्द्धि श्रीमद्दन्तपुराद्भगवतस्सकलभुवनतलोत्पत्तिस्थितिप्रलयहेतोः परमेश्वरस्य सततप्रणामावाप्तपुण्य सञ्चयप्रभावनिरस्ताशेषदुरितो गांगामलकुलगगनतलसहस्ररस्मि: अनेकचातुर्दन्तसमारविजयविमलविकोशनिस्त्रिश धारासमाक्रान्तसकलसामन्तनृपतिमण्डलाधिपतिमकुटनिहितरुचिरपद्मरागप्रभाप्रसेकपरिष्वंगैपींगांगीक्रितचरणयुगल : अतुलबलसमुद्यावाप्तविपुलविभवसम्पल्लतामण्डपच्छायाविश्रान्तसुहृत्साधुबान्धवार्थिजन : मातापितृपादानुध्यात स्त्रि कलिंगाधिपति श्रींमहाराजेन्द्रवर्म्मा .

Sāmantavarman's grant :—

'जयश्रीनिवासात्सौम्यवना चराचरगुरोरशकलशशाङ्कशेखरधरस्य जगत : स्थित्युत्पत्तिप्रलयहेतोर्म्महेन्द्राचलशिखर वरनिवासिनो गोकर्ण्णस्वामिन : सततप्रणामपरिचर्य्यादिभि : निर्द्धौतकालेयदोषो गांगामलकुलगगनतलसहस्ररासि : स्वासिधारापरिस्पन्दाधिगतराजशब्दस्त्रिकलिंगाधिपति : श्रीमहाराज महा सामन्तवर्म्मा ...

The difference in the *praśasti* given above is apparent and no comment is needed here. However there is one important factor to be noted, and that is the title, *Tri-Kaḷiṅgādhipati*. Of all the Early Gāṅga kings only Indravarman and Sāmantavarman had the title *Tri-Kaḷiṅgādhipati* (lord of Tri-Kaḷiṅga). If it were not an empty and meaningless boast, its omission in the charters of the successors of Sāmantavarman on the throne of Kaḷiṅga, might probably be due to political reversals they had sustained at the hands of their neighbouring powers.

From the time of Hastivarman, the third king of the dynasty the *praśasti* in the Gāṅga grants attained a sort of standardisation since his successors who ruled from either Kaḷiṅganagara or Dantapura [1] took his grants as models in drafting their own charters and adopted in them the preamble recorded in his Narasingapalli and Urlām plates.

A study of the *praśasti* recorded in the charters of Hastivarman's successors reveals the fact that further phrases and clauses denoting their regal glory, grandeur and prowess were added on to it in the course of centuries of their rule in Kaḷiṅga as they became more

1. According to the reading given by Mr. M. Narasimham it is *Dantipura*—not *Dantapura* in the plates dated 500 G. E., of Vajrahasta, son of Kāmārṇava,

and more powerful and their kingdom increased in extent and prosperity, so much so the preamble recorded in the late charters of the Early Gāṅga kings which grew lengthier and lengthier than in the early ones with high-sounding epithets and grand phrases and clauses, bears testimony to its slow but steady process of evolution and development.

Let us, now, proceed to examine the *praśasti* of the Early Gāṅgas in their charters, taking the formal preamble in Hastivarman's grants [1] as the basis.

Three important factors are alluded to in the grants of Hastivarman, namely, (i) about the capital city of the Early Gāṅgas, (ii) about their tutelary deity, Gōkarṇasvāmin and (iii) about their own valour and glory. The phraseology in the formal preamble of the Early Gāṅga charters is developed round these three fundamental factors.

For noting the gradual process of development in phrases relating to these three factors, the formal preamble (lines 1 to 8) of Hastivarman's record should be before us. It runs as follows:—

ओं स्वस्ति ॥ सवर्तुरमणीया द्विजयकलिङ्गनगरा त्सकलभुवननिर्म्माणैकसूत्रधारस्य
भगवतो गोकर्ण्णस्वामिनश्चरणकमलयुगलप्रणामादपगतकालिकलङ्को
विनयनयसम्पदामाधारः स्वासिधारापरिस्पन्दाधिगत सकलकलिङ्गाधिराज्य
श्चतुरुदधितरङ्गमेखलावनीतल प्रविततामलयशाः अनेकसमरसंक्षोभजनितजयशब्दो गाङ्गामलकुलप्रतिष्ठः
प्रतापातिशयानमितसमस्तसामन्तचूडामणिप्रभामञ्जरीपुञ्जराञ्जितचरणो मातापितृपादानुध्यातः
परममाहेश्वरः श्रीमहाराजो हस्तिवर्म्मा ... ...

This *praśasti* is found recorded in the grants[2] of Indravarman of 87, 87, and 91 years G.E., without any deviation anywhere.

Subsequent to 91 G.E., fresh phrases were added to the preamble. The chief seat of the Gāṅgas attained the dignity of a *vāsaka*; for example *Kaliṅganagara-vāsakāt*; *Dantipura vāsakāt*. The patron deity of the Gāṅgas, God Gōkarṇasvāmin, 'the sole architect of the construction of the whole world' (*sakalabhuvana-nirmāṇaika-sūtradhārah*) has now become firmly "established on the holy summit of the Mahēndra mountain" (*Mahēndrācalāmala-śikhara-pratishṭitah*) and become "the preceptor of (all) things, movable and immovable" (*Sakala carācara-gurōh)*. The mere "establishers of the pure Gāṅga dynasty (*Gāṅgāmalakula-pratiṣṭhah*) now became its ornaments (*Gāṅgāmalakula-tilakah*). *Caturudadhitaraṅga* has now developed into *pravitata-caturudadhi*

1. *Ep., Ind.*, XVII, pp. 330 ff.

2. *Ibid*, III, pp. 127 ff., *J. A. H. R. S*, IV, pp. 21 ff; *Ind Ant*, VI, pp 131 ff.

salila-taraṅga, and *anēka-samara-saṁkṣhōbha-janita* has transformed into *anēka-samara-saṁghaṭṭa-vijaya-jaṅita.* These developments are seen in the preamble in the records[1] of Indravarman of the years 128, 137, and 154 of the Gāṅga era. It must, however, be pointed out here that the first two of these records do not contain the passage "a recepticle of modesty and wealth" "(*vinaya-sampadām-ādhārah*"). The omission need not worry us. The development in the phraseology of the *praśasti* has to be determined by taking into account only the terms that are once added to the basic *praśasti* irrespective of their omission in the succeeding grants.

It is interesting to note here in this connection that the preamble of a grant[2] of Indravarman, dated 138th year G. E., differs considerably from that of the three inscriptions bearing dates 128, 137 and 154. It runs as follows:

> जलधिजलतरङ्गकरपल्लवालिङ्गितसकलकलिंगावनितलतिलकायमानात् विजयकलिंगनगरात्
> सकलभुवननिर्म्माणैकसूत्रधारस्य सकलशशाङ्कचूडामणेर्महाहिभोगपरिकरस्य
> महेन्द्राचलशिखरनिवासिनो गोकर्णस्वामिनोनवरतप्रणामाद्विगतकालिकलङ्क:
> सहजविनयापास्तारिषड्वर्गोदय: शक्तित्रयप्रकर्षावनत समस्तसामन्तशिरोमकुटमणिप्रभापल्लवित
> चरणाम्भोजयुगल: स्वाधिगतानेकविद्याकलाकलापप्रसादावाप्ताचार्य्यक: प्रथितविपुलामल
> गाङ्गान्वयाम्बर सकलशरच्छशाङ्को मातापितृपादानुध्यात: परममाहेश्वर: श्रीमहाराजेन्द्रवर्म्मा.

The reason for such a marked difference in the phraseology of the *praśasti* in this particular record is incomprehensible.

Besides, the difference in the form of characters of this record also adds to its peculiarity. Another noteworthy fact is that the writer and engraver of this charter are different from those of the previous and subsequent records dated 137 and 154 respectively. It must be, at the same time, pointed out here that besides the uniformity in characters employed in the charters dated 137, 154 and 183 of the Gāṅga era the writers and engravers also of these grants are the same.

The grant of year 138 G. E., seems, thus, to be an interloper in the middle. I have my own doubts as to the identity of Indravarman of this grant with the donor of the grants dated 128, 137 and 154 or 183 G. E. Future researches have to solve this problem.

An additional term is found in the phraseology of the formal preamble in Indravarman's record[3] of the 154th year G.E. The Victorious Kaliṅganagara which was "pleasant in all seasons" (*Sarvartu-ramaṇīyāt*) has now reason enough to be so (on account of the

1 *Ibid.* XIII, pp. 120 ff; *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, pp. 360 ff; *Ibid.*, XVIII, pp. 307 ff.
2. *Ind. Ant.*, XIII, pp. 122 ff.
3. *Ibid.*, VI, pp 131 ff.

simultaneous existence) of the comforts of all the seasons *(Sarvartu-sukha-ramaṇīyāt)*.

The preamble of the grants[1] of Dēvēndravarman, son of Guṇārṇava, dated 183, 184 and 192 G. E., marks yet another stage of development.

The attributes of god Gōkarṇasvāmin are the same, but the Gaṅga King feels himself much more stronger and his power more secure now than before. As such, he puts forth now extravagant claims that he is not only a receptacle of the three qualifications *naya*, *vinaya*, and *sampada* but also of "bravery, magnanimity, truthfulness and liberality" (*naya-vinaya-śaurya-audārya-satya-tyāga-sampadām-ādhārabhūtah*). Prior to 183 G. E., he was the mere "lord of all the feudatories, subdued by his valour" (*pratāp-ōpanamita-samasta-sāmantah*). But now he is "the sovereign of the entire feudatory realm" (*pratāp-āvanta-samasta-sāmanta-cakrah*). If the supreme sovereignty over the whole of Kaliṅga was obtained before by the "quivering of the edge of his own sword" *(svāsi-dhārā-parispand-ādhigata-sakala-Kaliṅgādhirājyah)*, it is now "acquired (in his own right) at the edge of his own sabre" (*nija-niśtrimśa-dhār-ōpārjita-sakala-Kaliṅg-ādhirajyah*). The city of Kaliṅganagara with all its glory is now "the ornament of the whole earth and endowed with victory" (*Sakala-vasumatī-tilakāyamānāt Vijayavatah Kaliṅganagarāt*).

The preamble of the record[2] dated the year 195 G.E., of the same king, Dēvēndravarman, extols him still more by attributing to him compassion, charity and courtesy" (*dayā-dāna-dākṣiṇya*). An additional term *mālā* is added *to taraṅgamēkhalā* to make it *taraṅgamālā-mēkhalā*.

Such additions and changes as shown above indicate the several stages in the gradual development of the formal *praśasti*. As stated before, it does not matter if the phrases or terms once added to the preamble were not continued in the succeeding grants. The thing to be determined is whether a term, phrase or phrases were newly added or was in use from the earliest record. Every term added marks a definite stage in the development and helps us chronologically.

From the year 195 G. E., there has come over a change in the form of characters used in the Early Gaṅga records. The letters in the record of 195 G. E., slightly differ from those in the previous charters. For the first time they assume the *Kuṭila* form.

Since the *praśasti* recorded in the grants of Dēvēndravarman, dated in 183, 184, 192 and 195 G. E., does not materially differ from

1. *Ep. Ind.*, III, pp. 130 ff; *J. A. H. R. S.*, II, pp 272 ff; *I. H. Q.*, XI, pp. 30 ff.
2. *Ep. Ind.*, XIII, pp. 212 ff.

that found in the grant [1] of 204th year of Anantavarman, son of Dēvēndravarman, Dēvēndravarman of these grants may be taken to be identical.

The year 221 G. E., forms another land-mark in the evolution of the early Gāṅga *praśasti*.

The Gāṅga capital, first referred to simply as *Kaḷiṅganagara* without any qualifying words or phrases, became, very soon, the victorious Kaḷiṅganagara which was charming in all seasons. Later on, it was virtually an ornament of all the land of Kaḷiṅga. In course of time it became pleasing (to the people) by virtue of the simultaneous existence of comforts of all seasons. No doubt then it was the ornament of the whole earth itself. After the Gāṅga rule had been firmly established in the Kaḷiṅga country and their regal pomp had increased, the splendour of that city was enhanced to such an extent that it now actually resembled Amarapura (*Amarapurānukāriṇah*), the city of gods, in the reign of Anantavarman's son, Nandavarman. whose grant [2] is dated 221 G. E.

The tutelory deity of the Gāṅgas god, Gōkarṇasvamin is now the receipent of "the crest-jewel called, moon" (*Śaśānka-cūḍāmaṇih*).

The rulers of Kaḷiṅga are now proud of proclaiming to the world to have been born to "the ornament of the spotless family of the Gāṅgas" *Gāṅg-āmalakūla Tilak-ōdbhavah* than in the simple "spotless Gāṅga family" *Gāṅgāmala-kul-ōdbhavah* as before. As to the excellent group of qualities like wisdom, modesty and etc., they were never deprived of them hereafter.

Beginning from the year 221 G. E., the form of characters employed in the Kaḷiṅga grants for nearly a century, had hardly undergone a change to any appreciable extent although a great deal of divergence in the manner of writing is noticeable—some of the records being written in big characters, some in small, others in beautiful round hand and some in shabby crooked lines and curves.

It is to this period, I assign the two undated records, namely the Chicacole plates [3] of Dēvēndravarman, and the Bangalore plates[4] of Dēvēndrāvarman. The names of the donors in both the grants are the same, but the names of their fathers differ, the Chicacole plates giving it as Arjunavarman, and the Bangalore plates, as Rājēndravarman. The name Arjunavarman is not met with in any of the early Gāṅga grants excepting in this. It was probably

1. *J. A. H. R. S.*, II, pp. 272 ff. C. P. No. 2 of 1920—21.
2. *J. A. H. R. S.*, II, pp. 185 ff; Bhārati., V, No, 3
3. *J. A. H. R. S.*, II. pp. 192 ff; C. P. No. 7 of 1918—19.
4. *Ep. Car.*, IX, Bn. 140.

wrongly written for Anantavarman, a common name among the Early Gaṅgās.

The *praśasti* in these two records, is not, word for word, the same as that in the previous records; some terms are added anew, and a few others are omitted. The Gāṅga ruler is still "devoted to the worship of the lotus feet of God, Gōkarṇasvāmin" *Gōkarṇa svāminaś-caraṇa-kamal-ārādhan-aika-tatparah*[8]. His two feet now acquired excellence *Vara-caraṇa-yugalah*" by the additional qualification *Vara.*" It is noteworthy that the donors of the Chicacole and Bangalore plates enjoyed "happiness" *kuśalatva* - "*Dēvēndra-varmadēvah kuśalī,* which their predecessors were devoid of.

A new phrase, "the destroyer of the principal mountains, (namely) their enemies "*dhvas-t-ārāti-kul-ācalah* also is found in the Chicacole plates of Dēvēndravarman. This phrase was in use in the Early Gāṅga grants till the middle of the fourth century of the Gāṅga era. Since this phrase as well as the term *Kuśalī* are found in the Vizagapatam grant[6] of Dēvēndravarman, son of Anantavarman, dated 254, the donor of the Chicacole plates must be his predecessor or successor. These additional phrases, absent in the grant of 221 G. E., suggest that the Chicacole plates were issued subsequent to that date. Let us see if we can still more precisely fix the place of the donors of the Chicacole and Bangalore plates.

The Chicacole and the Bangalore plates were engraved by Śrī Sāmanta Khaṇḍimalla and Śrī Khaṇḍivili respectively. If Khaṇḍivili has been wrongly written for Khaṇḍimalla as it seems probable then both may be said to be identical. The same person, Khaṇḍimalla was also the engraver of the grants of the Indian Museum plates, and the Tekkali plates[1] of Dēvēndravarman, son of Rājēndravarman, dated 308 and 314 G. E., respectively. The name, Khaṇḍimalla, a compound of Khaṇḍi and Malla, means Malla, son of Khaṇḍi. This Khaṇḍi father of Malla is, in my opinion, identical with Khaṇḍi Śrī Sāmanta, the engraver of the grant of Anantavarman's son, Dēvēndravarman, dated 254 G. E. If this is accepted then Dēvēndravarman, the donor of the Chicacole and Bangalore plates comes after 254 G. E. in point of time. Since the father of Dēvēndravarman of the Chicacole plates is Anantavarman (wrongly written as Arjunavarman) the donors of the undated Chicacole plates and that of the Vizagapatam plates, dated 254 may be taken to be identical. Then, Dēvēndravarman of the undated Bangalore plates and the donors of the Indian Museum and the Tekkali plates are also identical since their fathers bear the same name, Rājēndravarman.

1. *Ind. Ant.*, XVIII, pp. 143 ff.

In this connection a grant[1] of Dēvēndravarman, son of Anantavarman has to be taken into account. The date is given as *ēkapañcāśat* = 51. The editor of this record, Dr. Fleet, identified this king with Dēvēndravarman of 254 G. E., on grounds of palæography and of similarity in names, and stated that the date 51 is a mistake for 251 G. E. Let us see if his conclusion is correct testing it with internal evidence.

To determine the identity of this Dēvēndravarman palæography is not as sure and safe a test as the phraseology of the *praśasti* which is, in my opinion, a source of evidence of exceptional value, as far, at least, as the Early Gāṅga records are concerned.

The phrases *Amarapur-ānukāriṇih* and *Śaśāṅka - cūḍāmaṇih* occurring in the preamble of the grant under discussion, definitely prove that it was issued subsequent to 221 G. E. The term *kuśalī* takes it nearer the record of 254 G. E. Since this record contains another phrase *sita-kumuda-kund-ēndavadāta-yaśāh,* which is found in the next known grant—the Alamanda plates[2] of Anantavarmadēva, son of Rājēndravarman, dated 304 G. E., its place may be fixed somewhere between 254 and 304 G. E.

For determining the date of an early Gāṅga grant there is yet another important feature, the terminology of the years in Gāṅga era, has to be taken into account. The date of Indravarman's grant, the earliest Gāṅga record so far known, is expressed in simple terms as *pravardhamāna sam. (samvatsarāh).* In the next grant, the Narsingapalli plates of Hastivarman, a little development is found in the terminology. It runs as *Pravardhamāna-Vijaya-rājya-samvatsarāh.* This expression was continued in the grants of Hastivarman's successors till 304 G. E., in which year its developed form *Gāṅgēyavamśa-pravardhamāna-Vijayarājya-samvatsarāh* makes its appearance. Since no records between 254 and 304 G. E., have yet come to light it is not possible to ascertain how far earlier still this form came into use in the grants. It can, therefore, be plausibly concluded that this Dēvēndravarman belonged to a generation earlier or later than that of Rājēndravarmān's son, Anantavarman of 304 G. E. I prefer to placing him earlier than Anantavarman of 304 G. E., since the donor of 254 G. E., also happens to be a Dēvēndravarman, son of Anantavarman. In such a case, the donors of both the grants bearing the name, Dēvēndravarman, might, in my opinion, be identical. In the light of the above discussion Dr. Fleet's suggestion proves too correct to be refuted. This arrangement makes

1. *Ind. Ant.*, XIII, pp. 273 ff.
2. *Ep. Ind*, III, pp. 17 24.

the donors of the three grants, namely, the undated Chicacole plates, the grant dated 254 G.E., and the grant under discussion,–all identical.

Palæographical evidence supports this conclusion. Just as in the records dated 221 and 254 G. E., (See for example, अ in *Amarapur-ānukāriṇah*, and in *atra sīmālingāni*, and ग in "*sa-carā-cara-gurōh*" and in *Bhagavatō* and others) the sparse admixture of Nāgarī letters in the record under discussion precludes us from assigning to it a date as early as 51 G. E., or in the first century of G. E., when no trace of any such admixture is found in the Gāṅga grants. Since the characters in this grant assume *kuṭila* type, a late date has to be assigned to it. The *Kuṭila* form is noticable in the Early Gāṅga charters for the first time from the year 195 G. E. This type predominates from about 254 G. E. The date 251 G. E., therefore, stands the test.

The next grant so far discovered, after that of Anantavarman's son Dēvēndravarman, dated 254 G. E., is the Alamanda plates [1] of 304 G. E. of Anantavarman, son of Rājēndravarman. This gap of fifty years from 254 to 304 may be easily covered by at least two generation of kings. Unfortunately, grants of any Gāṅga king bearing dates within this period, have not yet come to light. However, this period may be postulated as the rule of Rājēndravarman, father of Anantavarman of 304 G. E., and of Dēvēndravarman of 308, 310 and the Bangalūr grant, despite the paucity of his records and the absence of any clue to establish his relationship with any of his predecessors.

We have now to consider here about two more undated grants, one belonging to Vajrahastadēva [2] and the other of Anantavarman,[3] son of Dēvēndravarman.

The preamble of Vajrahasta's record closely resembles that of the record [4] of 310 G. E., the phrases recorded in both being the same. He was undoubtedly a predecessor of Bhūpēndravarman's son, Dēvēndravarman of the Cīḍivalasa plates, [5] dated 397 G. E., the preamble of which, teaming as it does with many changes and additional phrases, serves as another landmark in the evolution and development of the Gāṅga vamśa *praśasti*. Vajrahasta seems to be still

1. *Ep. Ind.*, III, pp. 17 ff.
2. *Ibid*, Vol. III. pp. 220 ff.
3. *JAHRS.*, VIII, pp. 188 ff. *C. P.* No. 8 of 1918—19.
4. *Ep. Ind.*, XVIII, pp. 311 ff.
5. *JAHRS.*, II, pp. 146-164.

earlier than Rājēndravarman, son of Anantavarman, who issued the grants dated 304 G. E., as *Yuvaraja*, and 342[1] G. E., as crowned king. He may, therefore, be assigned a place somewhere about 310 G. E., in the chronological scheme of the Early Gaṅgas.

The *praśasti* of Anantavarman's record tallies with that recorded in the grants of Anantavarman, son of Rājēndravarman, dated in 304, and 308 G. E., with the exception of a few additional phrases, namely, *adhi* in *Kaliṅganagarādhivāsakāt*, *kamala* in *Varacaraṇa-kamalayugalah*, and *nirgata* in *kundēndvavadātavinirgatayaśāh*. A still further developed form of the last mentioned phrase into *sita-kumuda kundēndvavadātadigdeśavinirgatayaśāh*, may be seen in a record of 310 G. E. This, probably, furnishes the clue to fix the place of Anantavarman about 310 G. E. Anantavarman's father, Dēvēndra-varman of the grant under discussion may be identical with the donor of the grants, dated 304, 308 and 310 G. E.

The father of Satyavarman of the Chicacole plates[2] dated 351 G. E., and of Anantavarman, of the Tekkali plates[3] dated 3[58] G. E., happens to be the same — Dēvēndravarman. As such, Satyavarman and Anantavarman may be taken to be the sons of Dēvēndravarman whom I tentatively identify with Dēvēndravarman, the donor of the grants, dated in 308 and 310 G. E.

If Bhūpēndravarman, father of Dēvēndravarman is identical with Anantavarman's son, Rājēndravarman of 314 G. E., referred to above, the names, Bhūpēndra and Rājēndra being synonymous then may be put forth an interesting proposition. Dēvēndravarman's record[4] of 397 G. E., furnishes the pedigree of the donor for three generations as shown below:

Vajri
|
Mārasiṁha
|
Dēvēndravarman (Donor)

Now, I identify Mārasiṁha, father of Dēvēndravarman with Bhūpēndravarman or Rājēndravarman, and Vajri with Rājēndra-varman's father, Anantavarman of the Alamanda plates, dated in

1. *JBORS*. XII, p. 101.
2. *Ind. Ant.*, XIV, p. 10.
3. *C. P. No.* 3 of 1935-36; *JKRCOI*. (1935), No. 27. Here the date is taken to be 300 G. E. "*Aṭhavanasāha*" was not taken into account. The Superintendent of Epigraphy takes it to mean 58 cf. *vanasaha* with *pannasa*.
4. *JAHRS.*, II, pp. 146 ff. This is a grant of Dēvēndravarman, son of Bhūpēndra-varman. The ślōka in ll. 14, 15 and 16 of this grant furnishes, according to my interpretation, this pedigree of the donor: Vajri; his son, Mārasimha; and his son, Dēvēndravarman. From this it is evident that Mārasimha had the alias Bhūpēndravarman

304 G. E., to which period we have assigned Vajrahastadēva. Taking note of the contemporaniety of Vajrahasta, Anantavarman, father of Rājēndravarman, and Vajri, grandfather of Dēvēndravarman I am inclined to identify Vajrahastadēva under discussion with Vajri alias Anantavarman.

The next important record is the Cidivalasa plates of Dēvēndravarman, son of Bhūpēndravarman, dated 397 G. E., alluded to above. The script employed in this charter is entirely *Nāgarī*. *Nāgarī* replaced the *Vēṅgī-Kaliṅga* script in the Early Gāṅga records nearly four centuries after the beginnings of the Gāṅga rule in Kaḷiṅga. In the Gāṅga grants subsequent to this date *Vēṅgī-Kaḷiṅga* script becomes a rarity. Only for a short time after 397 G. E., an occasional admixture of the *Nāgarī* and *Vēṅgī-Kaḷiṅga* characters is noticable in the records, gradually the former preponderating over the latter.

The change is not restricted to script only. The *praśasti* also, as been stated already, underwent many changes. Kaḷiṅga-nagara is now developed into a big city with many temples and a large population. Hence, it is now described in very pompous terms as *anēka-dēva-kul-ākulā* and *ākalpānta-samkalpit-ānalpa-jana-sampat-samśōbhita-mahāmahimā*. Equally developed was the abode of the patron deity of the Gāṅgas, God Gōkarṇasvāmin. He is referred to in glowing terms as *prasiddha-siddha-tāpas-ādhyāsita-kandar-ōdara-Mahēndragiri-śikhara-śēkharah*, and *Tribhuvana-mahāprāsāda-nirmāṇaika-Sūtradhārah*. Even the Gāṅga kings are not satisfied with their former laudatory epithets. They are, now, described as *Sphūrjan-nija-bhuja-vraja-bhrājita-sakala-Kaḷiṅgādhirājyah*, and *mand-ānila-vēl-ākula-kallōla-jaladhi-mēkhal-āvanital-āmala-yaśāh*.

In the midst of such striking developments in the formal preamble, it counts for nothing even if the terminology, expressive of date in this grant is simple *pravardhamāna-vijaya-rājya-samvatsarāh*, as in the early charters.

Gāṅga grants have yet to come to light bearing dates between 397 G. E., and 500 G. E.

Three more records have yet to be considered, besides the one bearing the chronogram *nava-śataka-sapta-rasa*.[1] This record, though embodies in it the *praśasti* of the Early Gāṅga rulers, is in reality, a record of Vajrahasta dēva of the LATER GĀṄGAS.[2] Hence, I leave it out here.

1. *JBORS.*, XVII, pp. 175 ff.
2. *JAHRS*, XII, pp 91 ff; Vide my article, 'A note on the Mandasa plates of Anantavarman,'

The dates of the three records are 500, 520 and 528 G. E., and belong to Vajrahasta [1] son of Kāmārṇava, Dēvēndravarman [2] son of Anantavarman, and Madhukāmārṇava[3] respectively. Of these three grants the last two were issued from Kaliṅganagara and the first, from Dantipura. This is the third grant so far known to have been issued from Dantipura, the other two being the charters of Indravarman[4] of 39th year and of Indravarman [5] son of Dānārṇava of 137th year G. E. The name of the city in these grants is given differently. While it was termed as Dantapura in the grants dated 39th and 137th years, the record of 500 G. E., calls it Dantipura. In spite of these slight differences in name the city may be taken to be one and the same.

The qualifying phrases attached to the capital, whether it is Kaliṅganagara or Dantipura, are the same.

By the time of these grants the capital city was a big metropolis. It was adorned with marble-white palaces gleaming with uninterrupted lovely dances of courtezans and with many families of highly learned men. It was, therefore, described as *Sudhādhavala-prāsādamālād-aviratavāra-vilāsinī-lalita-lāsyād-uddaṇḍa-paṇḍita-kulālaṅkṛta Śri Dantipura (Kaliṅganagara) vāsakāt.*

Another point to be noted in the *praśasti* is this: the plain "holy summit of the Mahēndra mountain"—the residential seat of God Gōkarṇasvāmin is now covered with gold in confirmity with the prosperity of the Gāṅga kingdom, and that deity is now venerated as *Mahēndrācal-āmala-kanaka-śikhara-pratiṣṭhitaḥ.*

Neither of the names of the donor or of his father in the grant dated 500 G. E., ends in *varman* as in the previous records. Both the names are found in the lists of Gāṅga kings that preceeded Vajrahasta who was crowned in A. D. 1038, and in the same order also as father and son. This affords the clue to understand that, in reality, the donors of the Early Gāṅga charters and those of the Later Gāṅga records were of the same family.

TABLE OF EASTERN GĀṄGA GRANTS.

(Overleaf)

1. *Ibid.*, IX, pp. 23 ff.
2. *Ibid.*, III, pp 171 ff.
3. *JBORS.*, XVIII, pp 272 ff. *JAHRS.*, VIII, pp. 168 ff.
4. *Ibid.*, III, pp. 49 ff.
5. *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, pp. 360 ff.

Serial No.	King		Years in G. E.	*Undated grants*	*Issued from*
	Donor's father	*Donor*			
1	—	Indravarman	39	—	Dantapura
2	—	Sāmantavarman	64	—	Saumyavana
3	—	Hastivarman	79	—	Kaliṅganagara
4	—	,,	80	—	,,
5	—	Indravarman	87	—	,,
6	—	,,	87	—	,,
7	—	,,	91	—	,,
8	—	,,	128	—	,,
9	Dānārṇava	Indravarman	137	—	Dantapura
10		Indravarman	138	—	Kaliṅganagara
11	Dānārṇava	Indravarman	154	—	,,
12	Guṇārṇava	Dēvēndravarman	183	—	,,
13	,,	,,	184	—	,,
14	,,	,,	192	—	,,
15	,,	,,	195	—	,,
16	Dēvēndravarman	Anantavarman	204	—	,,
17	Anantavarman	Nandavarman	221	—	,,
18	Anantavarman	Dēvēndravarman	[*2]51	—	,,
19	,,	,,	254	—	,,
20	,,	,,	—	*C. P. No.* 7/1918-19	,,
21	Rājēndravarman	Anantavarman	304	—	,,
22	—	Vajrahasta	—	*Ep. Ind.*, III, 220	,,
23	Rājēndravarman	Dēvēndravarman	308	—	,,
24	,,	,,	310	—	,,
25	,,	,,	—	*Ep. Car.* IX, Bn. 140	,,
26	Anantavarman	Rājēndravarman	314	—	,,
27	,,	,,	342	—	,,
28	Dēvēndravarman	Satyavarman	351	—	,,
29	Dēvēndravarman	Anantavarman	358	—	,,
30	,,	,,	—	*C. P. No.* 8/1918-19	,,
31	Bhūpēndravarman	Dēvēndravarman	397	—	,,
32	,,	,,	—	—	,,
33	Kāmārṇava	Vajrahasta	500	—	Dantipura
34	Anantavarman	Dēvēndravarman	520	—	Kaliṅganagara
35	Anantavarman	Madhukāmārṇava	528	—	,,

1. My restored reading
2. Nāgana,

Writer of the grant		Engraver of the grant		*Pratibōdhaka*
Writer's father	*Writer*	*Engraver's father*	*Engraver*	
Bhānucandra	Dēvasiṅgadēva Vinayacandra	Bhānucandra	Vinayacandra	Āditya.
”	”	—	—	Buddhamañci-bhōgika
”	”	—	—	
”	”	—	—	Dēvabhōgika
”	”	—	—	
”	”	—	—	Koṇḍavallaka
Dēvacandra	Śaṅkaradēva	Vinayacandra	Ādityamañci	
Dharmacandra	Śaṁbapurō-pādhyāya	Āditya-bhōgika	Khaṇḍicandra-bhōgika	
Śaṅkaradēva[1]	Sarvadata[1]	—	Khaṇḍicandra	
Dharmacandra	Śāṁbapurō-pādhyāya	Āditya-bhōgika	Sarvacandra	
—	Pallavacandra	Khaṇḍicandra	”	
Mātṛcandra	Pallavacandra	”	”	
”	”	”	”	
”	Madanāṅkura-pallava	Śaṅkara	Nāgana boi	
—	—	Naṭamañci (?)	—	
—	—	—	—	
—	Nāgarāja	—	Sarvadēva	
Durgadēva	Ugradēva	—	Khaṇḍi	
—	Sarvacandra	—	Khaṇḍimalla	
—	Duggapa	—	Nāaṇa[2]	
—	Drōṇācārya	—	Naṅkañcyama(?)[3]	
—	Sarvacandra	—	Khaṇḍimala	
—	”	—	”	
	—	—	Khaṇḍivili	
—	Raha (?)	—	Dāmacandra	
—				
—	—	—	—	
—	—	Khaṇḍyama	Vīrapa	
—	—	—	—	
	Vijika	—	—	
—	Mudapa	—	Savvadapa	
—				
—	—	—	—	
—	Ayyana	—	Raṅgāmōju	
—	—	—	—	
Mādhava	Madhusūdana	—	Raṇama[4]	

3. The engraver might be Nāaṇa (Nāaṇa - Kānoyamācāri) himself.

4. He might be 'Ra(ṅ)gama' and not 'Raṇama'.

The next two records bearing dates 520, and 528[1] G. E., as stated already, were issued from Kaliṅganagara. Madhukāmārṇava, the donor of the latter grant is, in all probability, identical with the immediate predecessor of Vajrahasta, alluded to above. This again furnishes another piece of evidence to prove that the EARLY and LATER GĀṄGAS belong to the same dynasty and that the Gāṅgas of the Early grants are the predecessors of the Later Gāṅgas.

In the preamble of Madhukāmārṇava's record the phraseological development reaches its culmination. It is unnecessary for us to study this preamble any more since the rule of the so-called Early Gāṅgas terminates with that of Madhukāmārṇava.

1. I agree with Mr. R. Subbarao in taking the date of the Chicacole plates of Madhukāmārṇava to be 528 and not 526, the usually quoted one.

REVIEWS

THE NUMBER OF RASAS By DR. V. RAGHAVAN M. A., PH. D., Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras. Publishers: The Adyar Library, Adyar, Pages 192]

In this work Dr. Raghavan mainly discusses the place of S'ānta among the Rasas.

Though the Sanskrit compound 'Navarasa' is so very common today not only among the scholars, but even among the ordinary people, time was when Indian Rhetoricians recognised only eight Rasas. Bharata enumerates the Rasas thus :

शृङ्गार हास्य करुण रौद्र वीर भयानका:

भीभत्स्याद्भुतसंज्ञौचेत्यष्टौनाट्येरसा: स्मृता:॥

So, the ninth Rasa which is not included in the earlier works on Alaṅkāra is S'ānta, which might have found place in the list of Rasas, after the advent of Nāgānanda of S'rī Harsha, in the seventh century. Dr. Raghavan upholds the theory that S'ānta was not originally considered a Rasa at all, and opines that the reading of Bharata's Slōka quoted above was the composition of the later day students of Alankāra.

The exclusion of S'ānta from the list of Rasas by the earlier Alankārikas, is not due to their want of respect for S'ānta but it is due to the fact that they considered S'ānta to be on a much higher level than the other sentiments, the Sthāyibhāva of S'ānta being the highest conceivable or inconceivable thing, Ātman. Dr. Raghavan says that the counting of S'ānta as a Rasa at a later period does not in any way bespeak the want of respect for S'anta among our ancients; for as Dr. Raghavan says the Rasa of the great Epic, Mahabharata, is S'ānta, and the S'ānta atmosphere portrayed in the Ṛshyās'ramas in Raghuvaṁs'a and S'ākuntala is simply enchanting.

The last four sections of Dr. Raghavan's work contain learned discourses on the varieties among the various Rasas, the philosophy of Rasa, the three Bhāvas, *Sthayin*, *Vyabhichārin* and *Sāttvika* and the *Rasa* Synthesis.

For a student of *Alaṅkāra S'āstra* there is much to gather in Dr. Raghavan's work.

G. P.

ANCIENT INDIA. History of Ancient India for 1,000 years in four Volumes. From 900 B. C. to 100 A. D. Volume III. By Tribhuvandas L. Shah, Shashikant and Co., Baroda. Price Rs. 9/-

Vol. III of the series, which is under review, covers the history of Ancient India after the decline of the Mauryan Empire. The first

four chapters are devoted to the consideration of the salient features in the history of the S'unga dynasty. The preparation of what Dr. Shah calls 'a correct dynastic and chronological list of the S'ungas' is attempted. Fresh light is thrown on Patanjali, Pushyamitra, Agnimitra and Kalki. Sufficient emphasis is laid on the part played by Dematrius and Menandar in bringing about the fall of the Sungas. Eleven chapters follow in which the essential features, of the complicated histor y of the various foreign races who invaded India, are brought together. The next three chapters give us a detailed account of the Gardabhila dynasty and the S'aka rulers of Avanti. The last two chapters contain details about the original founder and duration of the different eras, a knowledge of which is considered necessary for a proper elucidation of the facts of Ancient Indian History.

Thus we are given a rich fare and much that attempt to shake to their foundations our preconceived notions on the subjects dealt with in the book. The chronological sequence of the S'unga dynasty presented by the author deserves careful investigation. The account given about the history of Mathurā and Takṣas'ilā (pages 201-224) is extremely interesting. His discussion, of the various eras, especially the Vikrama and S'aka eras, breaks new ground though we must defer, for the present, final judgment on his conclusions. His theories may startle us but the scholarship which they reveal and the zeal with which they are defended are extremely praiseworthy. Dr. Shah has done immense service to the study of Ancient Indian History by throwing a new searchlight on many problems.

The numerous chronological and analytical tables and the large number of maps enhance the value of the book. We can safely recommend it as a good reference book to any library containing serious books on Ancient Indian History.

G. N.

SOME ASPECTS OF ANCIENT INDIAN CULTURE (being the Sir William Meyer Lectures, 1938—39 of D. R. Bhandarkar M.A., Ph.D, Published by the University of Madras, 1940, pp. 87) Price Rs. 2/-

Dr. Bhandarkar, the famous scholar, throws a great deal of light, in this series of Lectures, on the manner in which Aryan Cultures came to India and influenced the older civilisation of the people, and the way in which in turn it was influenced by the surrounding circumstances.

To start with, Dr. Bhandarkar puts in a strong plea for the study of the Vedas from the *historical* point of view. The most sacred book of the Hindus has been read from the philological

literary and religious points of view, but very few have approached it as historical material, which tells us very much about the culture of the Aryans, *as well as the non-Aryans.*

Discussing the three terms Arya, Dāsa, and S'ūdra, he comes to the conclusion that Dāsa or Dāsyu was the name given by the Aryans setting down in India "to signify foreigners or barbarians of a dusky complexion;" and that later on this was replaced by the word S'ūdra—Anybody who was not a Brāhmaṇa or a Kshatriya or a Vais'ya, be he of indigenous or foreign extraction was considered a S'ūdra. The Essence of Aryan Culture was the recognition of the four *Varṇas*, (Brāhmaṇa, Kshatriya, Vais'ya and S'udra) and the four *āśramas* (Brahmacharya, Gṛihastha, Vānaprastha and Sanyāsa) or stages in life; but we are told that in Vedic times, in fact up till the Gupta period, the *varṇas* were mere classes, 'so that an Aryan could change one for the other, according to his character and occupation. Society was in a much more fluid condition than now.

As regards the worship of the gods, though the Vedas mention many deities, the religion advocated in them is henotheism or 'the exaltation of a single god at a time.' The idea involved in the famous verse *ekam sad viprā bahudhā vadanti* — sages name variously that which is but one — has fused all the jarring faiths of India into Hinduism, which is really therefore worship of one Universal God. The Ṛig Veda may well be called a hymnology replete with emotion and imagination of a high order; and its forceful appeal could not be resisted by the Mongols, Greeks, Chaldeans and other foreigners as well as the aborigines in the land who in course of time embraced the new faith and became absorbed into the Hindu Elements of society. This process of Aryanisation was possible, because in the old days Hinduism was a proselytising religion; its votaries were prepared to go to distant lands for the purpose of colonisation; and its missionaries were prepared to get converts from other faiths to their religion by prescribing various purificatory rites. This vigour or virility was kept up, as shown by archæological and numismatic evidence, till at least the 11th century, after which time it was gradually lost. In the ancient Hindu Social structure, caste was an elastic feature and a person may be raised or degraded according to his deeds. In his last lecture, the author shows that just as Aryan culture influenced other people, it was influenced by other cultures, notably those of Buddhism and Jainism. The glorification of Ahimsa, as one of the cardinal virtues and the deification of the cow as a sacred animal—these are but two instances of the way in which Hinduism absorbed some of the best features of the religion of the Buddha and the Jina. This was further recognised by regarding the Lord Buddha as an *avatār* of Vishnu and thus giving him a place in the Hindu pantheon.

As the outcome of the remarkable erudition and ripe experience of Dr. Bhandarkar, the book is of absorbing interest, not only to the historian but also to the layman.

N. R. K.

THE RĀMĀYANA POLITY by Miss P. C. Dharma, Women's College, Benares Hindu University Rs. 2/-

Miss Dharma deserves to be warmly congratulated for giving us a delightfully interesting little brochure entitled 'The Rāmāyana Polity.' Rightly does the Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri remarks in his foreword that 'it shows great industry in gathering material and sound judgment in interpreting the same.' Chapter I is in the nature of a general introduction discussing such questions as the date of the Rāmāyaṇa, the Aryans, the four varṇas and āśramas, the conception of an Itihasa as history etc. The next six chapters deal with the various parts of the central government, the king, the yuvarāja, the council of ministers, the sabha, judicial administration etc. Details of local administration are touched in chapter 8 while in a time of war like the present chapter 9, which concerns itself with the organization of the army and the ethics of war will be found most interesting.

The system of administration during the Ramayana period was of an advanced nature. It was 'a development of the vedic polity' and it anticipated to a great extent the later and more elaborate political system of the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya. It was far from sentimentary and will even compare favourably with the administration of modern times. We should not, however, carry the comparison too far. Political institutions like Rājakatṛi or the Sabha or Amātya-gaṇa in the Ramayana epoch should not make us forget that they imply nothing more than a general correspondence of conceptions, not a close parity in details with their modern counterparts, the king maker, the Assembly or the cabinet. Secondly, we are afraid, that Miss Dharma has overstressed the constitutional character of the monarchy during the Rāmāyaṇa period. Vālmīki was a poet and he gave us an idealised picture of the monarchy though the same may have been based to a large extent on concrete facts known to him. The people's voice in the choice of their king, the limitations imposed on him by the coronation- oath, the dependence of the king on the ministry and the various representative assemblies of the people were certainly checks but we know from ever so many examples in the pages of Indian History that monarchy in the earlier times was not of the constitutional type but belonged to the category of benevolent autocracies. Democratic institutions there were—alive and kicking, but they had a limited sphere of influence.

G. N.